UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,118	09/14/2006	Gregory Lyle Duncan	63461/101: 1	4082

3528   7590   07/21/2009
STOEL RIVES LLP - PDX
900 SW FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2600
PORTLAND, OR 97204-1268

EXAMINER
DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 September 2005*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 Sep. 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/23/2005 & 6/8/2006*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communication: Application filed 23 Sep. 2005. The Examiner has acknowledged/considered the original claims and the preliminary claim amendment, both filed 23 Sep. 2005.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite "a said schema". Claim should be amended as "a said schema".

Claim 7 recites the limitation "*applying a user selected format to said marked-up document*" in line 4. Line 5 of this claim the limitation "*generating…..using a user selected format ….*" Line 5 should be amended as to recite "*generating…..using [[a]] said user selected format ….*"

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14 is assigned dependency of claim 12. The Examiner has determined that Applicant meant for claim 14 to be a dependent claim of claim 13. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 7-11:

In summary, Claim 7 recites a "*method of producing a document*" comprising steps that may be performed manually and/or mentally. Thus, the recited method is not tied to a particular machine or apparatus. According, the recited method is nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 8-11 fails to further define the recited method as statutory subject matter as defined in 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The specification makes no mentioned of the

claimed subject matter, nor does it suggest the claimed subject matter in any way as to

reasonably convey Applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time of

filing.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said generated document" in line 7, whereas

previous recited as "a user-requested document";

"said implicit structure information" in line 8.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "said schema", whereas previously cited as "one or

more mark-up schemas". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the

claim.

Claims 3 and 9 recites the limitation "said minor structural elements", whereas

previously recited as "minor structural markup elements" in claims 2 and 8 respectively;

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "said format", whereas previous recited as "a document format" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 6 and 12 recites the limitation "said stored documents". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "said generated document" in line 5, whereas previously recited as "a user-requested document" and "said implicit structure information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "said format", whereas previously cited as "a user selected format" in claim 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "said implicit structure information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 15 recites the following limitations:

"said order" in line 5, whereas previous recited as "a customer order";

recites the limitation "said format" in line 10, whereas previously recited as "formatting formation" in line 6;

"said implicit structure information";

"said network";

"said electronic document".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitations "said customer" and "said transmitted document".
There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitations "said transmitted, "said requested document" and
"said customer" document". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in
the claim.

Claim 18 recites the limitations "said customer order" and "said customer". There
is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitations "said customer order", "said customer's
geographical location" and "said customer". There is insufficient antecedent basis for
these limitations in the claim.

Claims 20 and 21 recites the limitation "said customer order. There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Reulein et al. (Pat. No. US 7,035,837 B2; Filed Jan. 30, 2002) (hereinafter

"Reulein").

Regarding independent claim 1, Reulein discloses *a system for producing a*

document comprising:

a repository for storing documents in a marked-up form according to one or more

mark-up schemas adapted to make explicit the structural information contained a

document (col. 2, lines 24-26; col. 3, lines 19-27; Reulein discloses a repository for

storing XML document component and published document in one or form formats.).

a document format store for storing formats (col. 2, lines 24-26; col. 3, lines 19-

27; Reulein discloses a repository for storing XML document component and published

document in one or form formats.).

a document production processor for generating a user-requested document

from said respective marked-up form using a user-selected format, said generated

document retaining said implicit structural information (col. 4, lines 6-18 & 37-44; col. 8,

lines 4-59; Reulein discloses selecting a publication format for the publication. The

documents may be published in a variety of industry standards formats including

postscript, PDF, HTML, XML and metacode.).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Reulein discloses *the system of claim 1,*

wherein a said schema includes minor structural mark-up elements which must flow in

said generated document (col. 4, lines 19-29; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a

standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a document. DTDs are used to

validate proper assembly and structure of each document.).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Reulein discloses *the system of claim 2,*

wherein said minor structural elements include one or more of words, characters,

paragraphs, numbered paragraphs or special paragraphs (col. 4, lines 19-29; Reulein

discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a

document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure of each document.

The DTD may mandate that certain section of a document contain a traditional

paragraph structure.).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Reulein discloses *the system of claim 1,*

wherein said formats are a set of rules having parameters capable of user replacement

(col. 4, line 63-col. 5 line 7; col. 6 lines 26-48; col. 9 line 8-col. 11 line 3; Reulein

discloses formats are a set of rules having parameters capable of user replacement.).

In regards to independent claim 7, Reulein discloses *a method of producing a document comprising the steps of:*

marking-up a document according to a schema that makes explicit the structural information contained in said document (col. 4, lines 19-29; col. 7, line 14 – col. 8, line 47; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure of each document. Reulein also disclose the user editing/marking up a XML document/component. The XML components are mapped to the appropriate Document Type Definition (DTD) and/or schema.).

applying a user selected format to said marked-up document (col. 4, lines 19-29; col. 7, line 14 – col. 8, line 47; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure of each document. Reulein also disclose the user editing/marking up a XML document/component. The XML components are mapped to the appropriate Document Type Definition (DTD) and/or schema.).

generating a user-requested document using a user selected format, said generated document retaining said implicit structural information (col. 4, lines 19-29; col. 7, line 14 – col. 8, line 47; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure of each document. Reulein also disclose the user editing/marking up a XML document/component. The XML components are mapped to

the appropriate Document Type Definition (DTD) and/or schema. Reulein further

discloses an assembly subsystem that assembles documents into completed XML

formats.).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Reulein discloses *the method of claim 7,*

wherein a said schema includes minor structural mark-up elements which must flow in

said generated document (col. 4, lines 19-29; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a

standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a document. DTDs are used to

validate proper assembly and structure of each document.).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Reulein discloses *the method of claim 8,*

wherein said minor structural elements include one or more of words, characters,

paragraphs, numbered paragraphs or special paragraphs (col. 4, lines 19-29; Reulein

discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted construction of a

document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure of each document.

The DTD may mandate that certain section of a document contain a traditional

paragraph structure.).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Reulein discloses *the method of any claim 7,*

wherein said formats are a set of rules having parameters capable of user replacement

(col. 4, line 63-col. 5 line 7; col. 6 lines 26-48; col. 9 line 8-col. 11 line 3; Reulein

discloses formats are a set of rules having parameters capable of user replacement.).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reulein in view of Hendrickson et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0065852 A1; Filed:

Nov. 30, 2000) (hereinafter "Hendrickson").

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 11, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose

the system of claim 4 and the method of claim 10 respectively, wherein said parameters

result in a format of any one or more of: variable paragraph or word shapes, variable

paragraph spacing, variable character height, variable character width, variable font

colour, variable background colour, use of colour for differing classes of words, variable

character density, variable margin sizes, use of optically corrected font, use of shaded

font, variable line length, variable line spacing, use of separators between lines of text

and use of patterns in characters or words.

Hendrickson teaches *wherein said parameters result in a format of any one or*

more of: variable paragraph or word shapes, variable paragraph spacing, variable

character height, variable character width, variable font colour, variable background

colour, use of colour for differing classes of words, variable character density, variable

margin sizes, use of optically corrected font, use of shaded font, variable line length,

variable line spacing, use of separators between lines of text and use of patterns in

characters or words (0027-0030; Hendrickson teaches custom setting features which

allows the user to change formatting parameters such as font type, font size, text

justification, margins and other layout setting.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Hendrickson with Reulein for the benefit of allowing a

user to dynamically change the style of an online document (0007).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reulein in view of Gebert et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0111963 A1; Filed: Feb. 14,

2001) (hereinafter "Gebert").

Regarding dependent claim 6, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the system*

of any one of the preceding claims, wherein said stored documents and said formats

are in the form of XML files, and said production processor creates an XML:FO style

sheet from said XML format file, creates an XML:FO file from said XML document and

said style sheet, and generates an output file from said XML:FO file representing said

user-requested document.

Gebert teaches *stored documents and said formats are in the form of XML files,*

and said production processor creates an XML:FO style sheet from said XML format

file, creates an XML:FO file from said XML document and said style sheet, and

generates an output file from said XML:FO file representing said user-requested

document (0005-0008; 0014; 0023; 0030; 0042; Gebert teaches stored documents and

said formats are in the form of XML files, and said production processor creates an

XML:FO style sheet from said XML format file, creates an XML:FO file from said XML

document and said style sheet, and generates an output file from said XML:FO file

representing said user-requested document.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gebert with Reulein for the benefit of receiving as

input a source document in the XML presentation language and an XML style sheet and

transform the XML source document to an document including XSL-FO formatting

objects (0023).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the*

method of any one of claims 7 to 11, wherein said stored documents and said formats

are in the form of XML files, and said generating step includes creating an XML:FO style

sheet from said XML format file, creating an XML:FO file from said XML document and

said style sheet, and generating an output file from said XML:FO file representing said

user-requested document.

Gebert teaches *stored documents and said formats are in the form of XML files,*

and said production processor creates an XML:FO style sheet from said XML format

file, creates an XML:FO file from said XML document and said style sheet, and

generates an output file from said XML:FO file representing said user-requested

document (0005-0008; 0014; 0023; 0030; 0042; Gebert teaches stored documents and

said formats are in the form of XML files, and said production processor creates an

XML:FO style sheet from said XML format file, creates an XML:FO file from said XML

document and said style sheet, and generates an output file from said XML:FO file

representing said user-requested document.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gebert with Reulein for the benefit of receiving as

input a source document in the XML presentation language and an XML style sheet and

transform the XML source document to an document including XSL-FO formatting

objects (0023).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to

be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See MPEP 2123.

Claims 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Reulein in view of Gonzalez et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0019786 A1; Filed: Jul.

19, 2001) (hereinafter "Gonzalez").

Regarding independent claim 13, Reulein discloses *a system for producing*

and distributing a document comprising:

a server site including a repository for storing documents in a marked-up form

according to one or more mark-up schemas adapted to make explicit the structural

information contained in a document (col. 2, lines 24-26; col. 3, lines 4-27 & 46-55;

col.8, lines 4-11; Reulein discloses a repository for storing XML document component

and published document in one or form formats. Reulein also discloses a user browser-

based interface / web browser based, which is used for selecting, viewing online in a

viewable format and printing documents. Thus Reulien implicitly discloses a server site

including a repository for storing documents in a marked-up form according to one or

more mark-up schemas adapted to make explicit the structural information contained in

a document.), *a document format store for storing formats* (col. 2, lines 24-26; col. 3,

lines 19-27; Reulein discloses a repository for storing XML document component and

published document in one or form formats.)*, and a document production processor for*

generating a user-requested document from said marked-up form using a user-selected

format, the generated document retaining said implicit structural information (col. 4,

lines 6-18 & 37-44; col. 8, lines 4-59; Reulein discloses selecting a publication format for

the publication. The documents may be published in a variety of industry standards

formats including postscript, PDF, HTML, XML and metacode.).

    a network to which said server site is in communication (col. 3, lines 1-24; Fig. 1;

Reulein discloses a network to which said server site is in communication.).

    Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *a printing site to which said user requested*

document is sent via said network to be printed.

    Gonzalez teaches *a printing site to which said user requested document is sent*

via said network to be printed (0013-0017; 0025; 0028; 0034; 0044; Gonzalez teaches

routing customer orders received over an electronic network to a service provider (print

service provider).).

    Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a

given customer print order (0011).

    Regarding dependent claim 14, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *wherein*

said printing site coincides with said user.

    Gonzalez teaches *wherein said printing site coincides with said user* (0013-0017;

0025; 0028; 0034; 0050; Gonzalez teaches print service providers comprising a

gateway device configured to enable intelligent selection of a suitable print service

provider for a given customer's printing requirements. Gonzalez also teaches the

printing server provider being located in the vicinity of the delivery address specified in

the order.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a

given customer print order (0011).

Regarding independent claim 15, Reulein discloses *a method for producing*

and distributing documents comprising the steps of:

marking-up documents according to a schema that makes explicit the structural

information contained in said document (col. 4, lines 19-29; col. 7, line 14 – col. 8, line

47; Reulein discloses a DTD or schema is a standard blueprint for the permitted

construction of a document. DTDs are used to validate proper assembly and structure

of each document. Reulein also disclose the user editing/marking up a XML

document/component. The XML components are mapped to the appropriate Document

Type Definition (DTD) and/or schema.).

Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *receiving a customer order for a document*

over an electronic network, said order including formatting information;

applying a customer-selected format containing said formatting information to said marked-up document;

generating a customer-requested formatted document in electronic form using said format, the generated document retaining said implicit structural information; and

transmitting said electronic document over said network.

Gonzalez teaches *receiving a customer order for a document over an electronic network, said order including formatting information* (0050; Gonzalez teaches determining whether a printer service provider is able to deliver the required end printed product(s) (eg. those which did not support a given printing format, size of paper, media or ink type are discarded). Thus Gonzalez implicitly teaches receiving a customer order for a document over an electronic network, said order including formatting information.).

applying a customer-selected format containing said formatting information to said marked-up document (0050; Gonzalez teaches determining whether a printer service provider is able to deliver the required end printed product(s) (eg. those which did not support a given printing format, size of paper, media or ink type are discarded). Thus Gonzalez implicitly teaches applying a customer-selected format containing said formatting information to said marked-up document.).

generating a customer-requested formatted document in electronic form using said format, the generated document retaining said implicit structural information (0050; Gonzalez teaches determining whether a printer service provider is able to deliver the required end printed product(s) (eg. those which did not support a given printing format,

size of paper, media or ink type are discarded). Thus Gonzalez implicitly teaches

generating a customer-requested formatted document in electronic form using said

format, the generated document retaining said implicit structural information.).

> *transmitting said electronic document over said network* (0044; 0050; Gonzalez

teaches transmitting said electronic document over said network.).

> Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a

given customer print order (0011).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the*

method of claim 15, wherein said transmitted document is received by said customer.

> Gonzalez teaches *wherein said transmitted document is received by said*

customer (0058; Gonzalez teaches confirming that a print job has been completed and

shipped to the customer.).

> Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a

given customer print order (0011).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the*

method of claim 15, wherein said transmitted document is received by a printing site

that prints said requested document for forwarding to said customer.

Gonzalez teaches *transmitted document is received by a printing site that prints*

said requested document for forwarding to said customer (0050-0051; 0058; Gonzalez

teaches following printing of the job the service provider may then arrange for the job to

be shipped out to the customer.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a

given customer print order (0011)

Regarding dependent claim 18, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the*

method of claim 17, wherein said customer order specifies a printing site being of

closest geographically to said customer.

Gonzalez teaches *wherein said customer order specifies a printing site being of*

closest geographically to said customer (0058; Gonzalez teaches delivery of the print

product specified in a print order to an address specified in a print order. Gonzalez also

teaches consideration of geographical location of a given print service provider.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring

geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a given customer print order (0011).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the method of claim 17, wherein said customer order includes said customer's geographical location, and the method includes the further step of choosing a printing site that is geographically closest to said customer.*

Gonzalez teaches *wherein said customer order includes said customer's geographical location, and the method includes the further step of choosing a printing site that is geographically closest to said customer* (0058; Gonzalez teaches delivery of the print product specified in a print order to an address specified in a print order. Gonzalez also teaches. Gonzalez also teaches the printing server provider being located in the vicinity of the delivery address specified in the order.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a given customer print order (0011)

Regarding dependent claim 20, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the method of claim 17, wherein said customer order includes the price the customer is willing to pay, and the method includes the further step of choosing a printing site that offers a production and transport cost that meets the price.*

Gonzalez teaches *wherein said customer order includes the price the customer is willing to pay, and the method includes the further step of choosing a printing site that offers a production and transport cost that meets the price* (0047; 0048; 0050; Gonzalez teaches a gateway device receiving a customer order or an inquiry from a customer as to how much a given printing job will cost preferably in terms of printing cost and shipping cost. Gonzalez further teaches the gateway device is configured to wait for a pre-determined time so as to receive a reply as to whether or not the quote is accepted.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a given customer print order (0011).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Reulein does not <u>expressly</u> disclose *the method of claim 17, wherein said customer order includes the length of time that the customer is willing to wait for the document, and the method further includes the step of choosing a printing site that can produce and transport the document to the customer to meet that wait time.*

Gonzalez teaches *wherein said customer order includes the length of time that the customer is willing to wait for the document, and the method further includes the step of choosing a printing site that can produce and transport the document to the customer to meet that wait time* (0050; Gonzalez teaches selecting printed service

providers which are suitable/available. Gonzalez also teaches selecting printed service providers able to deliver the goods within the time specified in the order.).

Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gonzalez with Reulein for the benefit requiring geographical criteria to be taking into account in terms of minimizing final price of a given customer print order (0011).

NOTE

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

/Laurie Ries/
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100
20 July 2009